DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 182 RC 016 801

AUTHOR Holland, Kathleen E.
TITLE Parents and Teachers: Can Home and School Literacy Boundaries Be Broken?
PUB DATE Oct 87
NOTE 28p.; In: Education in Appalachia. Proceedings from the Conference; see RC 016 800.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Family; Black Students; Cooperative Planning; Grade 1; *Literacy Education; *Low Income Groups; Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; Parent Teacher Conferences; *Parent Teacher Cooperation; Primary Education; Reading Skills; Rural Urban Differences; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teaching Methods; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachian People; *Ohio (Columbus)

ABSTRACT

This study investigated home-school communication patterns between special reading teachers and parents of the children they served, with attention to teachers' and parents' views of each other as literacy supporters of children. The paper discusses the acquisition of literacy by children, formally at school and informally at home, as well as various social and cultural influences on literacy education, especially in Appalachia. Studies show that schools, particularly urban schools, often fail to recognize Appalachian culture and thus fail to serve the Appalachian child. Parent-teacher communication often is hindered by boundary-setting and territoriality in which the power balance traditionally is tipped toward the teacher. The research population was 13 Columbus, Ohio, urban Black and Appalachian parents of first-graders from poor and working-class economic backgrounds. The children were participating in the Reading Recovery Program, an early intervention tutoring program for first graders at risk of failure. Two styles of communication, active and passive, evolved among the seven teachers in the study. Active teachers tended to pursue parents relentlessly in order to get them involved with their children's education. Passive teachers used formal, less personal communication. Active teachers created three-way collaborative learning experiences, involving both parents and children in the education process. At conferences, parents discussed the home literacy context, while teachers discussed the formal school context. The paper concludes that active teachers were far more successful than passive teachers in obtaining parent participation and recommends that students take a bigger role in parent-teacher conferences and that the family-school relationship be a triangular one. Twenty-two references, four tables. (TES)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300182

Parents and Teachers: Can Home and School Literacy Boundaries Be Broken?

Paper presented at the Second Annual University of Kentucky Conference on Appalachia sponsored by The Appalachia Center of the University of Kentucky: October 23 & 24, 1987.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

KATHLEEN E. HOLLAND

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Kathleen E. Holland
Assistant Professor
Reading and Writing Program
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

RC016801

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Parents are the first teachers of their children. In the five years before formal schooling begins the family is the greatest influence upon the child's socialization process. Parents, siblings, and in some instances extended family members all provide early experiences which promote what the family values in all aspects of its existence. Family values touch every part of a young child's growth and development: physical, emotional, cultural, social, spiritual, psychological, and intellectual.

During the preschool years a child's intellectual learning primarily evolves from the family and home context. Social interaction with family members is seen as crucial, not only to the child's language development, but to the child's development of thinking (Bruner, 1983; Vygotsky, 1978).

In their own ways family members arrange speech encounters through which young children learn how to make their own communicative intentions clear and thus penetrate the intentions of others. The simply daily routines of eating, diaper changing, bathtime and bedtime, peek-a-boo games, nursery rhymes, and/or reading children's books can draw the child into conversational routines. These formats become so ritualized that young children soon anticipate and then initiate them with caregivers. "Humans still have to learn to use language and the only way they can learn is by <u>using</u> it communicatively," (Bruner, 1983). Communicative intent within the family is thus successively transformed among members into

into increasingly powerful linguistic procedures, including at a later stage of literacy - reading and writing.

Family Literacy

Family literacy traces its roots to the areas of language and cognitive development. The child's world is a "universe of discourse" consisting of all aspects of literacy: speaking, listening, reading, writing, and thinking (Moffet, 1968). Within the family, sharing literacy is an ongoing, socio-cultural process. Parents do not implement formal literacy lessons in the same way that teachers make daily lesson plans for children in the classroom; however, parents and other family members constantly teach literacy knowledge to children within the context of their everyday lives (Durkin, 1966; Clark, 1976; Bissex, 1980; Taylor, 1983; Heath, 1984).

> A child is not an empty vessel when he enters school; he comes replete with a set of abstractions about the world and himself, some of which he may have acquired from others but some of which he generated himself from his own experience (Moffet, 1968).

Children actively construct literacy knowledge. Rather than mirrors reflecting life and learning, they are active artists whose images of reality are portraits or reconstructions of their world and not merely copies of it (Elkind, 1981). They use language and thus literacy as a means of organizing a representation of the world and that representation so created constitutes the world they operate

in and becomes the basis of all predictions by which they set the course of their lives (Britton, 1970). The language and literacy of home accompanies the child to school. Vice versa, the language and literacy of the school enters the family literacy context through the child.

Once formal schooling begins, family literacy contexts often assume a role that is peripheral to formal school literacy instruction. The professional teacher assumes primary responsibility for the child's literacy learning. Teachers and parents recognize boundaries between the formal literacy learning taking place at school and the more informal family support of literacy knowledge in the home. Thus, the school becomes the place where "real" literacy knowledge is learned; the home is a secondary environment for the acquisition of such knowledge. A problem then evolves for many parents in that the family context is often not seen as an important, if not crucial, literacy knowledge arena.

> The sad irony is that education for the majority of children will only be successful when there is trust, accountability, and responsibility shared between families, communities, and schools. Being aware of the power and significance of families does not mean that schools should not be held accountable for teaching children. Rather the opposite - once school personnel begin to value the significant place of families in the educational process, they will feel more responsible to the communities they serve and to the children they teach. Once teachers become more cognizant of the forms and styles of learning within families, education may be seen more holistically and the medium and message of school can be designed to be adoptive to the values and idiom of community life. (Lightfoot, 1981)

In the early school years children are constantly shifting between the formal school literacy context and the informal family context. Specific and incidental literacy experiences may occur in both environments. The child may be put in the position of prime communicator between the teacher and parents. A teacher may or may not include parents in their child's school literacy development. Parents may or may not attempt to support their child's growth in reading and writing at home.

Cultural Influences On Literacy Development

Ethnographic researchers have explored the social dynamics of family literacy contexts within cross-cultural populations. Heath (1983) attempted to answer the question: "What were the effects of preschool home and community environments in the learning of those language structures and uses which were needed in classrooms and job settings?" She completed her research in three different communities: Roadville, Tracton, and Townspeople. Roadville was a white, Appalachian, working class community made up of textile workers. Trackton was a black working class community made up of textile workers who were formally farmers. The Townspeople were the mainstream school-oriented community. Children from the first two communities were unsuccessful in school; yet both communities placed a high value on success in school. Both were literate communities in the sense that the residents

of each were able to read printed and written materials, and on occasion they produced written messages.

There were radical differences among the three communities in the ways in which children and adults interacted during preschool years. In Trackton, children "learned to talk" while in Roadville and among the townspeople, adults "taught them how to talk". Upon entry to school, children had to learn to select, hold and retrieve content from books and other written or printed texts in accordance with their community's rules or "ways of talking" and the children's learning followed community paths of language socialization. Heath posited that the ways of talking employed in the school may, in turn, build directly on the preschool development, may require substantial adaption on the part of the children, or may even seem directly counter to aspects of the community's pattern. Attempting to teach children from language or ethnic minorities to use reading in middle class ways promoted egalitarianism and homogenity. Simultaneously, it often denied the children's home context and estranged them from the origins. However, to accept and extend the literacy patterns of the home honored and promoted cultural diversity. Success in this vein may decrease the compliance of some children with mainstream ways, but it may also reinforce their identities and preserve community pluralism.

Anderson and Stokes (1984) have argued that literacy is influenced largely by social institutions and not cultural membership. They researched low income families from three cultural groups: Black American, Mexican American, and Anglo American. Many of the businesses and institutions within American society were found to exert a strong influence on the literacy practices of these low income families. The most frequently occurring domains of literacy activities within these low income families were: (1) entertainment, (2) daily living, (3) religion, and (4) school-related activities. The average amount of time spent on literacy activities per day was 75 non-conservative minutes. It was found that Anglo parents initiated a comparatively larger number and wider range of literacy activities but their children worked at them for a shorter duration than those initiated by Black or Mexican American children.

Two barriers were discovered which prevented parents from actualizing the literacy teaching potential of the home: (1) the role of the school and (2) the role of routine home activities in teaching children to read and write. In the first instance, parents wanted to help their children do well in school but they did not feel they possessed the necessary competence to be effective teachers of literacy for their children. Parents believed that school teachers were more capable due to their special training. Therefore, school teachers were the experts and the only legitimate source of literacy training for children.

The second barrier was parents' perceptions of the routine of home activities. Parents need to be made aware of the literacy teaching potential of their daily activities. Parents need to increase their sense of competence regarding their ability to be effective teachers of literacy for their children. Finally, parents needed to be provided with procedural information and strategies which will allow them to actualize the literacy teaching potential of events embedded in their normal daily activities.

One American culture, Appalachian, has only recently received the attention of researchers (Henderson, 1966; Rhodes 1968; Wagner, 1977). Appalachian children have unique problems because teachers and principals held strong attitudes against their culture, especially concerning the Appalachian child's attitude toward education, their high degree of mobility, persistent absenteeism, high drop-out rate, and cultural language patterns.

Borman and Mueninghoff (1983) set out to describe and analyze the family, school, and neighborhood settings as they figured in the lives of Appalachian children in Cincinnati. School often became an institution for selective sorting which often overwhelmed and defeated Appalachian students. "Although parents value success in school and in the world of work, they may be unwilling to see their children sacrifice an engagement with life in the active, individualistic way that is seemingly antithecal to studiousness" (p. 213). Maloney

(1974) found a forty percent school drop-out rate among Appalachian children in the Cincinnati schools. All of these studies concluded that urban schools were failing the urban Appalachian child. "If the schools continue to ignore their responsibilities throughout the 1970's and into the 1980's, urban Appalachian children will continue to lose faith in themselves and respect for their heritage" (Wagner, p. 294).

Parent-Teacher Communication

Dramatic shifts in urban schools in recent decades have caused deeper divisions between home, school, and communities. Brofenbrenner (1970, 1974, 1978) argues that the school is becoming increasingly isolated from the home, with significant consequences for the behavior and development of children.

> Specifically, I suggest that the alienation of children and youth and its destructive development sequelae reflect a breakdown of the interconnections among the various segments of the child's life-family, school, peer group, neighborhood, and the beckoning, or all too often indifferent or rejecting world of work. (1979, p. 849)

Boundary setting and territoriality between teachers and parents are often entangled with negative and rigid stereotypes of one another. Lightfoot (1981) suggests that one of the reasons why the struggles over territoriality are rarely articulated, clarified, and resolved is because there are very few opportunities for parents and teachers to come together for meaningful, substantive discussion. Schools organize

public, ritualistic occasions (e.g. PTA meetings, Open House, newsletters) that rarely allow for real contact, negotiation, or criticism between parents and teachers. These tend to be institutionalized ways of establishing boundaries between insiders (teachers) and interlopers (parents) under the guise of polite conversation and mature cooperation.

In analyzing the decisions that arise between parents and teachers during conferences, Lightfoot saw them as a product of the competition and materialism in our society.

> The school is seen as the major mechanism of standardized competition of human resources. Children are viewed as property to be developed, protected, and controlled by parents; and parents are their ambivalent sponsors who must find effective strategies for receiving their children's studies in some future and unknown society. (p. 102)

Lightfoot suggested that educators should "listen for the child's voice" even to the point of including students in conferences, if they wish to develop positive relationships with parents and children. She argued that the family-school relationship should be a triangular one involving the experiences and perspectives of parents, teachers, and children. When adults begin to focus on their reasons for coming together in a conference in the first place and begin to act in the best interest of the child, defensiveness and territoriality lines erode.

Burke (1985) has called for increased collaborative efforts in communication among parents, teachers and children.

Within the collaborative relationship, each participant is accepted as an equal among equals. The consensus of the participants then becomes the preferred form of problem solving and all responsibilities are shared.

Statement of the Problem

One of the purposes of this naturalistic inquiry study (Holland, 1987) was to investigate, describe, and compare home-school communication patterns between special reading teachers and parents of the children they served, with attention to parents' and teachers' views of each other as literacy supporters for children. More specifically, what is or is not the power shared between parents and teachers in the literacy experiences of children? What are the ways teachers do and do not involve parents in their children's literacy development? What does and does not work in teacher-parent communication?

Population

The research population was thirteen urban Black and Appalachian parents of poor and working class socioeconomic status whose first grade children attended what were considered the worst inner city schools in Columbus, Ohio. Their first grade children were participating in the Reading Recovery Program, (Clay, 1985) an early intervention program which takes first graders "at risk" of failure in reading and writing and through systematic and sensitive daily, individual

tutoring moves them to a level of reading and writing independence and success within a four to six month period.

(Insert Table #1 - Parents)

The researcher met with these thirteen families four different times during the 1985-86 school year in their homes as their first graders progressed through the Reading Recovery Program. Through the use of formal and informal interviews, written and audio-taped field notes, questionnaires, collections of literacy samples, and checklists, the researcher sought to gather information about the dynamics of family literacy support systems, parent views of the Reading Recovery Program in the lives of their children, and home-school communication patterns. Seven teachers, who were tutoring these parents' first graders, were also interviewed by the researcher about how they attempted to involve parents in the Reading Recovery Program and their own attitudes about parent involvement in children's literacy development.

(Insert Table #2 - Teachers)

Teacher Styles of Communication

Two styles of communication evolved among the seven teachers which greatly influenced parent involvement and support of the Reading Recovery Program. Of the seven teachers in this study, four were found to us an active style

TABLE 1

FAMILIES: RACE, AND CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS, AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Family #	Name	Racial/ Cultural Background	Socioeconomic Status
2 *	The Robertsons	White, Appalachian	$ 0-4999
3	The McCalls	White, Appalachian	$ 0-4999
4 **	The Burns	Black	$ 5-9999
5	The Turners	Black	$ 0-4999
6	The Williams	Black	$10-14,999
7	The Jones	Black, Appalachian	$10-14,999
8	The Richmonds	Black	$ 5-9999 ***
9	The Walters	Black	$10-14,999
10	The Kingstons	White, Appalachian	$10-14,999
12	The Andersons	White, Appalachian	$15-19,999
15	The Applegates	White, Appalachian	$10-14,999***
16	The Taylors	White, Appalachian	$30-39,999
17	The Logans	White, Appalachian	$25-29,999***

*Families 1, 11, 13, and 14 each dropped out of the study at various points and for various reasons: moving, illness, family death and difficult pregnancy.

**Mrs. Burns is a White, non-Appalachian grandmother who was married to a Black man. She is alone and raising her Black grandchildren born of Black parents.

***Two parents working combined annual income.

TABLE 2

READING RECOVERY TEACHERS

Teacher	Race	School	Assignment	Years Exp.
Amanda Smith	B	Houghton	Chapter One	28
Lenore Scott	W	Darby	Classroom	11
Caroline Masters	W	Darby	Chapter One	12
Diane Stewart	W	Darby	Classroom	15
Margaret Reed	W	Darby	Chapter One	20
Deborah Miller	W	Fenmore	Classroom	16
Bridget Leahy	W	Fenmore	Chapter One	15

of home-school communication, while three were using a passive style of communication with parents.

(Insert Table #3 - Styles of Communication)

Active Style of Teacher Communication

The four active teachers tended to pursue parents relentlessly in order to get them involved in their children's literacy development. The teachers used a personal, persistent, and flexible style of communication with parents. They would call parents on the phone, send handwritten notes, and take advantage of any face-to-face encounters in order to convey information about the program and children's progress. These teachers remained persistent in their attempts to involve parents. They did not give up when notes or phone calls failed. They shifted communication choices because they expected their parents to be involved.

Active teachers communicated a sincere need to parents when they contacted them. The message was very clear from teacher to parent: "I NEED YOUR HELP to teach your child to read and write. We have to work together for your child's success." Active teachers then sought specific appointment dates and times to meet with parents about the Reading Recovery Program and their children's progress in reading and writing. They respected parents' busy family and work schedules and used flexibility when scheduling meeting with parents.

TABLE 3

STYLES OF TEACHER-PARENT COMMUNICATION

Ms. Leahy, Ms. Miller, Ms. Smith, Ms. Masters	Ms. Scott, Ms. Reed, Ms. Stewart
1. Active Approach	1. Passive Approach
2. Persistent follow-up communication	2. Communication sent one time only
3. Personal: phone calls, notes, and face-to-face encounters	3. Formal Reading Recovery letters or parent-teacher conferences
4. Early communication during first month of children's tenure in Reading Recovery	4. Early formal notification letter with no follow-up
5. Message: "I need your help to teach your child to read and write. We have to work together for your child's success	5. Message: "Come in if you want to do so.
6. Specific appointment dates and times sought at teachers' initiations	6. General open-ended invitation: "Come in anytime" leaving initiative to parents
7. Flexibility and respect for parents' schedules, especially working parents. Parents are allowed to set appointment time and dates within the confines of the regular school day.	7. Lack of flexibility or respect for parent schedules. Ms. Scott and Ms. Masters show respect for parent transportation problems by holding formal parent conferences in Darby and Washington neighborhoods so parents can walk.
8. Expect parent to observe a lesson with their children as an integral part of their Reading Recovery Program.	8. No expectation of parent lesson observation as an integral part of Reading Recovery Program.
9. Reading Recovery books and cut-up sentences not sent home at Fenmore until parents understand proper literacy support procedures.	9. Reading Recovery books and cut-up sentences sent home without directions. Parents over-emphasize traditional literacy support behaviors with books and used flash card methods with cut-up sentences.
10. Parents understand the Reading Recovery Program and their roles as literacy supporters of children at home.	10. Parents are confused about Reading Recovery Program and their roles as literacy supporters of children at home.
11. Strong rapport and trust between parents and teachers.	11. Less rapport and trust between parents and teachers.

And finally, these active teachers acted on their need for parent involvement and took the initiative to schedule a convenient time for the parent, child, and teacher to participate together in a Reading Recovery tutoring lesson. Active teachers wanted parents to understand the Reading Recovery Program and their roles as important literacy supporters of their children. Active teachers tended to have strong rapport and trust with their parents.

Passive Style of Teacher Communication

Three teachers used a more passive approach in home-school communication. They used formal and less personal school letters, which were only sent once with no further follow-up communication of any other sort. Passive teachers tended to give parents open-ended and less specific "come in anytime" invitations. This general, open-ended communication left the initiative to parents for the maintenance of home-school communication.

Passive teachers relied on less flexible scheduling of meetings, such as Parent-Teacher conference days or Open House meetings, which more than half of the parents in this study could not attend due to work schedules, lack of transportation, or need for babysitting services. Because parents did not come to school, passive teachers viewed them as apathetic and uninvolved in their children's literacy development. These teachers did not expect parents to really

Passive teachers tended to have poor rapport and trust with their parents.
and uninvolved in their children's literacy development.

Collaboration

While the passive teachers asked, "Why bother?", the active teacher personally invited most of their parents up to the school one at a time to observe a Reading Recovery lesson. During the lesson, teacher, parent, and child collaborated on the literacy events within one context.

This experience allowed teachers to do many things: (1) demonstrate supportive literacy behaviors; (2) model proper use of literacy materials; (3) answer parent questions and concerns about reading and writing support at home; (4) form an alliance of trust with their parents; and (5) send a strong message to Reading Recovery children that parents and teachers care about them and will work together to help them become successful readers and writers. Active teachers took full advantage of this shared literacy context to teach parents about reading and writing development as well as learn from parents what they were already doing at home to help their children learn to read and write.

This collaborative experience had a powerful impact on parents. These parents had never been invited to the school for a positive school visit. They were excited after seeing what their children could do very well and successfully. They

had never seen a professional educator teach their children reading and writing. Parents were amazed at what the active teachers were doing with their children and what their children could do in reading and writing. This observation of the teacher tutoring the child helped parents understand the Reading Recovery Program.

After this three-way collaborative experience, parents felt empowered as literacy supporters of their own children. They entered an alliance with the active teacher based on professional respect, shared concern for the child's literacy development, and the teachers obvious care about their child's welfare. Parents went home and told everyone - family, friends, and co-workers - about Reading Recovery, which became positive public relations for the school system.

Children, too, benefited from this three way collaborative literacy conference. They had the opportunity to show their parents positive literacy behaviors they could accomplish with their teacher. They also had the chance to share a school literacy context with their parents.

Children were able to have their parents and teachers meet together in their presence and talk about them. Children concretely saw parents and teachers concerned about their well-being and heard teachers tell their parents what had to be done at home. Children could remind parents what teachers had said at the observation lesson in order to encourage their parents to practice proper literacy support at home. Parents

could remind children what teachers had said in order to get them to perform reading and writing activities at home.

Field, Tenor, and Mode

This collaborative venture among parent, child, and teacher, contrasted sharply with parents' experiences in formal parent-teacher conferences. One method of comparison (Halliday, 1975) used was to examine the field (context), tenor (power balance), and mode (discourse style) of Reading Recovery lesson observations and formal parent-teacher conferences.

(Insert Table #4)

The field of context of the Reading Recovery lesson observation was the actual lesson itself. The three participants shared a common experience from which to discuss their separate roles and obligations within the child's literacy development. More importantly, the parent participated through observation in a school literacy context. In the formal parent-teacher conference the child is the center of discussion but two contexts for discussion exist. The teacher talks about the school literacy context while the parent talks about the home literacy context. There is no shared literacy context between parents and teachers in traditional parent-teacher conferences.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF TRADITIONAL PARENT/TEACHER CONFERENCES
AND READING RECOVERY LESSON OBSERVATION

Reading Recovery Lesson Observations	Traditional Parent/Teacher Conferences
1. Participants: parent, teacher and child	1. Participants: parent and teacher
2. Time: 30-60 minutes	2. Time: 20-30 minutes
3. Focus: Reading Recovery lesson under observation and parent literacy support role	3. Focus: Child's literacy behaviors in the school context
4. Emphasis: Collaboration among parent, teacher and child participation	4. Emphasis: Teacher directed
5. Parent Role: Observation of lesson, discussion of home literacy activities, receiver of teacher's specific suggestions and participant in conference with teacher about child's progress and further needs.	5. Parent Role: Listens to teachers report of child's school progress and may have chance to ask questions.
6. Field: Shared context of Reading Recovery lesson in progress	6. Field: Separate contexts of school and home not shared by parents and teachers
7. Tenor: Collaborative participation shared among parents, teachers, and children	7. Tenor: Teacher as powerful entity and source of knowledge concerning child's literacy progress
8. Mode: Speaking, listening, reading and writing.	8. Mode: Speaking and listening.

In the Reading Recovery observation the tenor or power base of the Reading Recovery lesson is shared among the three participants; each player has an important role to play. The teacher's power comes from her professional knowledge about how she, parents, and the child should help each other. The parent has power from the observation and the support offered to the child at home. The child has power merely by being present at the observation and displays of reading and writing abilities. While the teacher is respected as the most knowledgeable literacy supporter, the scales are not totally tipped against the parent because the teacher needs the parent to talk about home literacy experiences and methods of family literacy support.

In the traditional parent-teacher context the power balance is tipped heavily toward teachers. Parents come to the school which is the teacher's familiar territory. Parents wait for the teacher to report to them about children's performances in the school literacy contexts. Since this context is unfamiliar to parents, parents have nothing in which to compare the home literacy context. Teachers do most of the talking at these conferences which may run twenty to thirty minutes. If parents disagree with teachers about children's performances in the school literacy contexts because they have seen children do positive behaviors at home, their views are usually not accepted because school literacy context behaviors have more credibility.

The mode or discourse styles present at the Reading Recovery lesson observations are complete. Speaking, listening, reading, and writing occur during the lesson and in the three way conference afterwards. Parents have a chance to see their children's school reading and writing support behaviors. Teachers have opportunity to model proper reading and writing support behaviors. Children are able to show their parents their reading and writing skills within the school context. In the formal parent-teacher context, speaking and listening are the modes of communication. Parents and teachers talk about children's reading and writing behaviors within the school context. Parents do not see their children acts as readers and writers in school. Children are not even present at formal parent-teacher conferences.

Implications

The Reading Recovery lesson observation involving collaboration among parent, teacher, and child was one of the most powerful impacts upon parents in this study. Another powerful impact was the teacher's style of communication because the active teachers were far more successful that passive teachers in obtaining parent participation in both children's literacy development as well as the Reading Recovery Program.

If teachers are to encourage successful parent participation, they should initiate active, personal, persistent, flexible, and positive communication efforts with

parents. Teachers must believe that parents are an integral part of the reading/writing program and expect parents to participate. Teachers should initiate communication early in the program to get parent involved and give information. Phone calls, handwritten notes, and face-to-face parent contact are more effective than formal program communication.

If teachers are to help parents understand reading/writing programs, they need to hold collaborative sessions where parents can observe their children and they can also talk about effective literacy support behaviors. Teachers need to fulfill their professional teaching role with parents as well as children. When teachers model effective literacy support behaviors, parents can understand what they should do at home. They need to help parents look at various kinds of reading books and writing materials and know how to use each kind. Teachers need to help parents realize the literacy opportunities already part of the everyday lives within families.

If teachers are to increase parent participation, they should initiate collaborative school literacy experiences for themselves, children, and parents. This collaboration provides a shared literacy context on which to base communication. The shared context could be reading a book to a child or writing with a child. Collaborative efforts help parents become knowledgeable about school literacy and specialized language. Children see parents and teachers

working together for common goals.

Parents are the first teachers of their children. But, instead of teachers totally usurping that role away from parents and ignoring the significant and critical literacy support role parents can play in their children's lives, parents and teachers should and can work together collaboratively with children to powerfully impact upon literacy development at home and at school.

Note: Information about the Reading Recovery Program may be obtained from: Dr. Guy Su Pinnell, 200 Ramseyer Hall, 29 West Woodruff Street, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43210. Phone: (614) 292-0711

Bibliography

Anderson, Alonzo B. and Shelly J. Stokes. (1984). "Social and Institutional Influences on the Development and Practice of Literacy." In HIllel Goelman; Antoinette Oberg; and Frank Smith (Eds.), Awakening to Literacy. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, pp/ 24-37.

Bissex, Glenda. (1980). Gnys at Wrk. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Borman, Katherine M. and Elaine Mueninghoff. (1983). "Lower Price Hill's Children: Family, School and Neighborhood." In Betteau, Allen (Ed.) Appalachia And America. Lexington, kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, pp. 210-225.

Britton, James. (1970). Language and Learning. New York: Penguin Books.

Brofenbrenner, Uri. (1970). Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brofenbrenner, Uri. (1978). "Who Needs Parent Education?" Teachers College Record, 79:767-787.

Bruner, Jerome. (1983). Child's Talk: Learning to Use Language. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Burke, Carolyn. (1985). "Parenting, Teaching, and Learning as a Collaborative Venture," Language Arts, Vol. 62, 8:836-843.

Clark, Margaret. (1976). Young Fluent Readers. London: Heivemann Educational Books.

Clay, Marie. (1985). The Early Detection of Reading Difficulties, (3rd Edition). Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.

Durkin, Delores. (1966). Children Who Read Early. New York: Teachers College Press.

Elkind, David. (1976). "Cognitive Development and Reading." In H. Singer and R. B. Rudell (Eds.) Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading (2nd edition). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Halliday, M. K. (1975). Learning How to Mean - Exlorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Henderson, G. (1966). "Poor Southern Whites: A Neglected Urban Problem," Journal of Secondary Education.

Holland, Kathleen. (1987). The Reading Recovery Program on Parents and Home Literacy Contexts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. (1981). "Toward Conflict Resolution: Relationships Between Families and Schools," Theory into Practice, 20, 2:97-104.

Maloney, M.E. (1974). The Social Areas of Cincinnati. Cincinnati, Ohio: The Cincinnati Human Relations Commission.

Moffett, James. (1968). Teaching the Universe of Discourse. New York: Houghton Miflin Company.

Rhodes, C. (1968). "The Appalachian Child in Chicago Schools", Appalachian Advance.

Taylor, Denny. (1983). Family Literacy. Exerter, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher PSychological Processes. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, T.E. (1977.) "Urban Schools and Appalachian Children," Urban Education, 12:283-296.